ORIGINAL

	MOTERAL MATERIAL STATES AND A STATE OF THE STATES AND A S
1	in the superior court of the state of the st
2	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI
3	S Smisko
4	THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
5	Plaintiff,
6	vs.) No. CR 2008-1339
7	STEVEN CARROLL DEMOCKER,
8	Defendant.)
9	
10	
11	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE THOMAS B. LINDBERG JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
12	DIVISION SIX
13	YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA
14	PRESCOTT, ARIZONA
15	TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2009 3:01 P.M.
16	
17	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HEARING ON MOTIONS
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	ROXANNE E. TARN, CR
25	Certified Court Reporter Certificate No. 50808

1 SEPTEMBER 22, 2009 3:01 P.M. 2 APPEARANCES: 3 FOR THE STATE, MR. JOE BUTNER. FOR THE DEFENDANT, MR. JOHN SEARS, MR. LARRY 4 HAMMOND, MS. CAMPBELL. 5 6 This is State versus Steven THE COURT: 7 Carroll DeMocker, CR 2008-1339. 8 Mr. Hammond, Mr. Sears, Ms. Chapman, here 9 on behalf of Mr. DeMocker, who is present. Mr. Butner is 10 here on behalf of the County Attorney's Office, representing 11 the State. 12 We have reset this matter from 13 August 25th, and that day I did receive a motion from the 14 defense, an alternative motion to dismiss the death penalty notice for lack of probable cause or, in the alternative, for 15 16 probable cause hearing on noticed aggravating circumstances. 17 The next day, August 26, I received a 18 defense motion for re-examination of conditions of release, 19 and I also, previous to that, had a State's motion and order 20 for release of victim medical records. And I think, subsequently, received a 21 22 further State's motion -- and I am not sure that this is 23 right for today -- but to compel UBS to comply with other 24 things than what they already have with regard to a subpoena.

So State and defense ready to proceed,

25

In fact,

1 Mr. Butner? 2 MR. BUTNER: State is ready, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Sears? Defense is ready, your Honor. 4 MR. SEARS: THE COURT: What would you like to take up 5 6 Has the issue of the medical records been resolved? 7 MR. BUTNER: No. It hasn't, Judge. Mr. Kottke sent me letter that said, well -- first of all, 8 9 let me explain. 10 I called Mr. Kottke and said, you know, "What's the problem with the medical records," et cetera, and 11 he indicated, "Well, we've already provided them to 12 Mr. Sears, and you can get them from Mr. Sears." And then he 13 said, "We don't have any objection, anyway." 14 And I said, "Well, please execute the 15 HIPAA releases, just to be safe. We haven't gotten the 16 medical records yet." And today I stand before you, we still 17 don't have any medical records. 18 Mr. Kottke sends me a letter that says 19 get them from Mr. Sears, basically, and also notes that they 20 will continue to assert the attorney-client privilege in 21 22 regard to the divorce records that are in possession of 23 attorney Robert Fruge. In our conversation, Mr. Kottke indicated 24

25

that he thought that they would waive privilege in regard to

those, too, but then in his written response on September 15, he indicates they are asserting that privilege.

THE COURT: You received a response last week.

MR. BUTNER: Yeah. The long and the short of it being, don't have the medical records.

Judge, please just order them. That way we can get them without further chasing our tails or chasing Mr. Sears's tail or chasing Mr. Kottke's tail or somebody else's tail. Thank you.

THE COURT: Do you need to be heard on this, Mr. Sears?

MR. SEARS: I think I do, maybe just to correct a couple of assertions that I just heard here, Your Honor.

Here is where we are with respect to the medical records. The medical records, actually, as far as we can determine, consist of some bone scan imaging done at the hospital in connection with the autopsy performed by Dr. Keen on July 3rd of last year, apparently because Dr. Keen did not have -- himself and the medical examiner's office -- the equipment necessary to do that work himself. There are no other records that I am aware of that are either being sought by the State or are being protected by the personal representative.

I have told Mr. Butner, both directly and

in e-mails, the following: That we had obtained a release from Katie DeMocker addressed to our mitigation specialist, Mr. Hudson, and that we were obtaining those records, and that when we got them, we would provide them to Mr. Butner.

About ten days ago I got an e-mail from Mr. Hudson saying that he had finally heard back from Yavapai Regional Medical Center. They had sent him payment information, which he had turned around and sent back to them and was waiting for those records. So those are the records that I think are out there, and that is the status.

It has always been our intention to provide them directly to Mr. Butner. We are certainly not hiding them. We are not conspiring with Katie DeMocker to keep them from the State. We are interested in them, and we have no interest in keeping them from the State.

It seemed simpler, under the circumstances, for us to get them in the way we did, because we were ahead of the game. If Mr. Butner had the release today, he would be in line behind us. So I don't think there is going to be a problem. I think they're coming shortly.

Nor have I heard directly from Mr. Butner what, if anything, the lack of those records has done to delay their investigation in this case. The autopsy work and Dr. Fulginiti's work was done many, many months ago, in this case. So that is the state of that.

Another thing that I have advised --1 2 THE COURT: Before I leave that, then, do you 3 think you need an order from me to have YRMC produce them? 4 MR. BUTNER: Yes. THE COURT: So ordered. 5 I've signed the order, Mr. Butner. 6 Ιf you need to get them separately from YRMC, you may. 7 MR. BUTNER: Thank you, Judge. 8 9 MR. SEARS: There is one other part. THE COURT: Back to you, Mr. Sears. Sorry for 10 11 the interruption. That's fine. I just wanted the MR. SEARS: 12 Court to understand that we weren't interfering in any way 13 14 with this. We were trying to do it as expeditiously as 15 possible. But frankly --16 THE COURT: But you don't have them yet 17 either, at this point. MR. SEARS: No. And we really don't care if 18 the State gets them directly and gives them to us or vice 19 It makes no difference. I think we're both aiming at 20 21 the same thing here. One hopes. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. Now, with respect to 23 MR. SEARS: the divorce records and Mr. Kottke's involvement in this 24 25 As the Court knows, Mr. Kottke is a lawyer who

practices in tax and estate planning work. He is not a litigator, and he is not a criminal defense attorney. And he has told me a number of times, and I am sure would tell the Court, that there is a point in this case at which he reaches a level of discomfort, and he feels that he is there.

As a result, my understanding is that Katie and Charlott intend, finances permitting, to retain separate counsel, who is someone who would practice in this area, who can directly respond to Mr. Butner. We've told Mr. Butner that, and I think the letter that he is pointing to in his file from Mr. Kottke mentions that same fact.

So, again, it's not as if the estate is stonewalling the State on this case. It's just that Mr. Kottke does what he does very well and is smart enough not to venture into areas beyond his area of expertise. But we expect that that would happen pretty shortly, and that independent counsel for Katie and Charlott would be in a position to deal directly with Mr. Butner about that issue and about other issues that Mr. Butner has raised with Mr. Kottke.

So I wanted to report that information to the Court, to correct any suggestions that any of the DeMockers, including the DeMocker daughters, are in any way trying to stonewall or interfere or otherwise cause problems for the State in this case. I think it's just the contrary.

THE COURT: Thank you. You filed a motion, that I mentioned, alluding to the probable cause for the death penalty issues. Obviously, I've heard some degree of evidence already, but the motion was phrased as an alternative for probable cause hearing, with regard to the noticed aggravated circumstances. And I am aware of and have read the -- it's Chronis -- Judge Steinle's position in that case that just came down in June, and I've read that.

So I recognize that you are entitled to such a hearing and to develop additional evidence or have the State develop additional evidence to what I have already heard. I guess I need to know how much time that's going to take and what additional you all want me to hear.

MR. SEARS: Your Honor, did you see my reply?

THE COURT: I saw the reply, and I note that

the State was late in terms of its response, but I also note

that the request was made in the disjunctive and alternative

and that the alternative was asking for additional hearing on

the matter. So I am willing to grant the hearing, if you

think I need to hear any additional evidence.

The question is: How long is it going to take? When could both sides be ready for that?

MR. SEARS: If I could just be heard, Your

Honor. Given that this is a capital case on that very issue
regarding the untimeliness of the State's response to this

tremendously important motion and how that, we think, impacts this case and perhaps pre-stages a much larger problem regarding how this case is proceeding, I tried to draw those issues out in my reply.

understand, and it remains equally difficult for us to understand today how the State could simply allow an obvious deadline on a motion as critically important as this, to simply go by with no effort whatsoever to contact us, to ask for an extension of time for any reason, nor to do what custom and practice normally requires, which is to file a motion in large time before the time expires.

And in fact, to us it looks like nothing happened until I sent an e-mail on Wednesday the 16th, very early in the morning, to Mr. Butner, saying that we were going to file a motion now seeking to have this treated as an unopposed motion, and that we wanted to be sure that there wasn't some claim or problem that they hadn't received our original motion. I never did hear back from Mr. Butner.

What I got instead at the end of the day was an e-mail from his office with these pleadings saying they were going to be filed at the end of the day. And I don't want to suggest that we are simply exalting form over substance here, Your Honor. Here is where we see this is a very real problem in this case.

though.

Mr. DeMocker has been in jail, now, eleven months -- eleven months tomorrow. This case is not set for trial until May of next year. The State --

THE COURT: That was at request of both sides,

MR. SEARS: It is, Your Honor. But let me tell you what our great concern is.

Our great concern is this: You set, on May 12, discovery cutoff for the State of June 22nd. You told the State, in that hearing, that if they had material that they wanted to disclose after that date, they could do so with leave of Court on good cause shown. It would appear to us that the State has basically not taken that order of the Court to heart.

At this point today, as I stand here, we have not received one single piece of discovery, not one word from Mr. Echols, their financial fraud expert. And we know that Mr. Echols began working on this case in December of 2008. We know that, in addition to the subpoena that is attached to the motion to compel that's been filed this past week, there were three earlier subpoenas directed to UBS for documents. So Mr. Echols has had, in addition to the UBS documents, subpoenas issued by the County Attorney's Office for bank records, for other financial records, and has been working on this case since early December of last year.

June 22nd came and went. Nothing from Mr. Echols. Nothing from the State.

September 22nd is here, Your Honor, three months after the discovery cutoff. Not a word.

The State files this request for a delayed response to our death penalty motion, saying they are in critical need of information from UBS so that Mr. Echols can produce some sort of a report. They don't explain what it is, how it relates to it or, most importantly, any reason why Mr. Echols's work has not been disclosed at this point.

So here is my concern: We take your calendar and we pick a hearing date for the <u>Chronis</u> hearing in this case, and the day before the hearing, Mr. Echols delivers us a report. Mr. DeMocker can't possibly be ready to go to a hearing under those circumstances.

I've asked you to enter an order doing three things: Confirming the June 22nd discovery cutoff, which I think the State needs to hear from you, and entering an order stating that the State will be precluded from offering, again, ever, any late disclosed or undisclosed evidence or material, unless they've obtained leave of court to do that.

In addition, they noticed the existence of a blood spatter and crime scene expert, Mr. Rod Englert of Oregon. We have not seen one word from him in this case.

And yet the State, in their response, talks about crime scene evidence.

They have noticed a man named Kiviyat as a forensic photography expert. Not a shred of information from him. In fact, not a shred from any expert in this case. No new tire track, footprint tracking, any forensic expert in this case.

And we are fearful, because now we have seen it happen, that the State will essentially say, well, here it is June 22nd, doesn't apply to us, it doesn't apply to this, and if you are not ready, then we will delay this some more. And the reason we are concerned is because that is the precisely what they have done here, Judge.

They have filed a motion saying -- they have filed a late response with no explanation for it being a week late, which cut into my reply time -- my reply is actually due today, based on their filing -- with no explanation. Not the courtesy of a phone call or anything.

Just a "we're sorry," after the fact.

Then they file, in that same motion, a request for leave to file a delayed response, based on this naked assertion that they need information from UBS before Mr. Echols can finish his work. Think about what they are asking the Court to do.

The subpoena that they are talking about,

that is attached to their pleading, was issued on April 16 of this year. It is, I think, the fourth such subpoena to UBS. It was responded to, as you can see from their attachments by Mr. Henzy on behalf of UBS, in full, completely in detail, one month later, May 18 of this year.

We don't see a single word from the State saying that the May 18th submission by UBS was incomplete or unsatisfactory, until they need more time to prepare for the Chronis hearing. And then all of a sudden, three months later, and after the discovery cutoff goes by, they file a motion to compel -- which I agree with the Court is not ready to be heard today. Mr. Henzy obviously has a right to be heard.

But this is what I think is going to happen: I think it is very clear, from what I know about this, that UBS has no intention of giving up customer information of Mr. DeMocker's in their possession to the State without a Court order. And they indicate that if such a Court order is eventually obtained, they will appeal in this case.

So the delay that Mr. Butner is proposing requires Mrs. Butner to litigate with UBS. Then, if Mr. Butner prevails at some unspecified time, perhaps months in the future, then to get that information to Mr. Echols, who will do something with it and produce something, which we

will then have to evaluate and respond. The indefinite nature of that delay is stunning.

We are not talking about -- as far as I can tell from Mr. Butner -- a week or two or three. We could be talking about months over months before he gets that. Nor has he made any real showing, other than conclusory statements that this information from UBS is critically important, to explain, A, why he did nothing about it until last week, even though he knew on May 18th, presumably, that the response was not adequate. That's what he is claiming now.

He did nothing about it before the discovery cutoff went by. He has not yet even today asked for leave of Court to have late disclosed or undisclosed information from Mr. Echols deemed admitted in some proceeding in this case.

There is no way, if this conduct is some precursor of what is to come, that this case is going to be able to go to trial. If the State can do this, if the State can continue to investigate this case on its own schedule at its own pace and we are compelled to scramble and respond to it, it will be impossible for us to be ready to go to trial.

We disclosed to Mr. Butner that we had discovery, and we sent him a letter and said we have it on a CD. And just as we have to pay for their discovery, it cost

us \$78 to compile the CD. Send us a check for \$78, and we'll send you the CD. I never heard from Mr. Butner. You know, I don't have any interest in doing that. I will just hand it to Mr. Butner. I don't need the \$78.

MR. BUTNER: Thank you, Mr. Sears.

MR. SEARS: I asked for \$78, and we will just take care of that.

But we are doing our best to keep this case on track for trial, Your Honor, but this is the concern we have. This is why we filed this reply. We are not in the business, I would submit, of nickel and diming around the edges of the rules.

We are genuinely and sincerely concerned that unless something changes and changes soon about the way the State is pursuing their investigation in this case, that we will never be able to get this case to trial anywhere near May of next year, and that's the reason.

Now, having said that, I think that these issues and the way in which the State is investigating this case have some implication in what Mr. DeMocker's release conditions should be, and in a while, when we get to that part of today's hearing, I will talk again about that.

But I wanted to let the Court know the degree to which we are genuinely upset about what is happening. It is not a personal dispute with Mr. Butner and

the County Attorney's Office. This is a capital case with the defendant in custody.

And we have, as you said, picked this court date because we thought it was realistic and it could happen. But now because of the way things have positioned themselves, we are not so sure, anymore. And this is the first instance where it is clear to us that unless something happens at this point, this case is going to fall completely off the rails, and we are going to lose control of what needs to be done in this case.

One final point: We have told the Court that we would continue trying to work with the County Attorney's Office to schedule interviews and evidence review. I have sent Mr. Butner an e-mail first proposing some specific dates, which have come and gone with no response about scheduling them, and I have sent him another e-mail saying essentially that because we have the manpower on the defense side, pick any date. We will cover, within reason, any date for this work.

We have at least two or three more days of evidence review. We did two full days and went through most of the documentary evidence. We have not looked at any of the physical evidence on this case.

We have come to a complete standstill on witness interviews in this case. I talked about it last

month when we were here. Nothing much has happened since
then. I am still available, essentially, and I will
represent to Mr. Butner and the Court any day -- any day from

now to get this work done.

But if we don't start doing that soon, that will become another separate, equally compelling problem in getting this case in line for trial in May. I don't mean to be overly dramatic, Your Honor, but this is terribly concerning to us.

And frankly, we are at a loss to understand how the State can treat a death penalty case and a motion -- the first real substantive motion dealing with the death penalty in such a manner. It just stuns us. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Butner.

MR. BUTNER: Judge, I am not going to grandstand on this issue, but I will start with Mr. Kottke's letter, which is addressed to me, with a copy to Katherine DeMocker, personal representative. And it just amazes me how Mr. Sears knows the contents of this letter. He isn't even copied on it, and yet he knows what Mr. Kottke told me. That is just starting with the medical records, which we asked for months ago. Okay?

It is interesting that Mr. Sears knows that UBS as no intention of giving up customer information,

when I finally got to talk to Mr. Henzy personally today before I came over here, and Mr. Henzy told me that today, for the very first time.

I think what is going on here is, yeah, there is foot-dragging all right, and the foot-dragging is from the other side of the aisle, Your Honor. And the foot-dragging is from Mr. DeMocker's employer, who is being represented by Mr. Henzy. I have been trying to get ahold of him for weeks. He informed me he was out of the country. He had taken a trip to Ireland.

I have been trying to get some interviews of a couple of people that Mr. DeMocker had contact with -- basically, he worked for. As a result of these lack of interviews that I have been trying to schedule through Mr. Henzy, I don't have complete financial information. It's not intelligible to Mr. Echols.

And I point out -- if I understood the Court's ruling about disclosure on the 22nd of July, the cutoff, the ruling was that expert analysis could come later. And in fact, what the State did was -- we had a guy living in Phoenix, basically, copying all of these computer records and so forth, and doing it as quickly as was possible to get it disclosed to the defense, and now we have had those records being analyzed. And Mr. Echols is almost done. And I had a meeting with him a couple of days ago, but he isn't done yet.

Actually, it was yesterday I had the meeting with him. He isn't done yet. I hope I will have something very soon. I can't say exactly when.

Similarly, I don't have a report yet from the blood-spatter expert. But you heard Mr. Sears note that he was disclosed.

I don't have a report yet from the lighting expert, but you heard Mr. Sears note he was disclosed. Those are all disclosures that were made in accordance with the Court's order.

The pre-staging of a much larger problem. Yeah, the much larger problem is that we encounter a stonewall effect -- and that is the word that Mr. Sears used -- whenever we bump into Mr. Kottke, who represents the estate, or Mr. Henzy, who represents UBS, and who also represents Mr. Farmer in this matter, and who probably is going to represent Mr. VanSteenhuyse -- if I am saying his name correctly -- but who doesn't represent Miss Onnon, because she's got a separate attorney, and that is Mr. Terribile -- I hope I said his name properly.

And what we are trying to do is coordinate through all of these lawyers, and we are bumping into a stonewall at every level.

Judge, we are trying to disclose everything as quickly as possible. When Mr. Henzy responded

_

to those subpoenas, he didn't say "I am not sending this and I am not sending that, and I am objecting to this and I am objecting to that." He didn't do that. Okay?

The materials were provided. They were being analyzed by Mr. Echols. Mr. Echols then got with me and said, "Look. It looks like all of this stuff is not there. Okay? It looks like all of this stuff is not there."

There were four categories, is my recollection.

And so we are looking at this stuff, trying to figure out what is not there. That's not easy to do.

That's why I finally, since I could never get ahold of Mr. Henzy -- I finally filed a motion to bring the records. Let's have an in-camera inspection and see what is there and what is not being provided and what is being asserted as being privileged. Didn't have a response that did that from Mr. Henzy. Still don't, but at least I have a phone conversation where Mr. Henzy promised to send me a letter to explain those things and why some things aren't disclosed and some things don't exist, et cetera. And of course, that motion, as the Court pointed out, is not ripe yet.

Judge, the probable cause hearing, as I understand it, on these aggravating factors, is in the nature -- as it was described in the case, I believe -- of a

preliminary hearing. Well, what happens at a preliminary hearing is -- my recollection, it's been a while since I've done one, thank goodness -- but my recollection is officers and witnesses and so forth, if they have reports, they show up with their reports. They give them to the defense, they give them to me, if they have one, and then we proceed with the hearing. And the defense gets to cross-examine on the basis of the witness's report, if they have one, and we proceed in that fashion. That's what I anticipate we will be doing.

I am putting pressure on Mr. Echols to get me a report as quickly as possible. And as soon as I get a report, I will disclose such a report. But that is the way I understand that kind of a hearing to be.

And similarly with Mr. Englert and also the lighting expert -- and I can't remember if his name is -- I think it's Kiviyat. It's a peculiar name that I have trouble remembering. In any event, I don't have a report from either of them yet either, although I have asked for a report from Mr. Englert.

And I hadn't noted, until Mr. Sears brought it up, that I had not yet received a report from Mr. Kiviyat. I am not sure yet if he is going to give me a report. I'll have to find out about that.

So is this undisclosed evidence? Yes,

it's expert witness analysis undisclosed evidence, which the Court exempted from that ruling, which we will promptly provide to the defense, just as we have promptly provided as much disclosure at every step along the way, right up until today's date, when Mr. Sears asked me to get out of evidence these books that Mr. DeMocker had ordered and bring them with me.

And I said, "Well, you know, nobody from the sheriff's office is coming." And I said, "Can you have somebody from your office get them?" And Mr. Sechez was kind enough to go down and check them out of evidence and bring them for Mr. Sears today.

And I thank you, again, Mr. Sears, for giving us that CD.

In terms of never heard back from Mr. Butner about being late with the motion, I don't know, maybe Mr. Sears doesn't read his e-mails.

But I sent you an e-mail, and it said we have been experiencing delays -- not that you haven't heard me say that before. Right, Mr. Sears?

same day that I filed the motion response, or the following morning. I can't remember. I didn't think it would be an issue.

In terms of courtesy, until this moment

1.8

in time, things have been moving along rather courteously.

am not so sure it's going to be that way henceforth. I

certainly hope so.

THE COURT: Let's try and keep it that way.

My preference would be if you would

MR. BUTNER: Yes, Your Honor. I understand.

address your comments to the Court rather than to Mr. Sears.

I apologize to the Court for filing a response late. The error is mine. It just didn't get calendared. I promptly responded when Mr. Sears brought it to my attention, and I appreciate him doing that, too, quite frankly.

This indefinite delay, yeah, it is stunning all right, but it isn't, certainly, a delay that has been occasioned by foot-dragging on the part of the State.

In fact, we are doing everything we can to get these things accomplished in an expeditious fashion. We have spent two full days looking at evidence.

I was there -- I would say probably the majority of the time, barely, because I had other things to do and could not devote all of my time to them. But we got a lot done. We still have a lot more to do, and we are working toward getting those things done.

I was in hopes that I would be able to do interviews this week, Judge, and I was scheduled to be in

trial the last three days of this week. That defendant is going to plead guilty tomorrow morning and has signed a plea agreement. So I suddenly have got those three days available for interviews, and, of course, we will try and do that.

Judge, all I can say is that we are doing the best that we can in terms of disclosure of expert witness opinions. We have already disclosed their identities. And I think I probably said enough now.

THE COURT: Well, again, if there is a need for an additional hearing -- I recognize that I have already had a <u>Simpson</u> hearing. I received a bunch of evidence on the case. I have had a lengthy amount of hearings that provided me with information about the case.

I guess what I need to know is if you need to present something additional — it seems to me that the financial review only has to deal with one potential aggravating factor and not the others. And so I guess the question I have is, how much more time do we need? Do I need to schedule that before the November set of hearings that I have already reserved four days in November?

MR. BUTNER: Judge, I do think that we need a couple of hours in a hearing of that nature. I do think that Mr. Echols is going to shed considerable light. He has kind of previewed what he can provide for the State in terms of its case, and I think that that's going to be very important

evidence, and I think it is also something that the defense is going to want to have. And so I think that that will be important.

I think that probably -- in going through the transcript of the Simpson hearing and going through the

I think that probably -- in going through the transcript of the <u>Simpson</u> hearing and going through the Court's ruling, I think that there are other matters that also need to be addressed. I would ask that the Court leave it open on all of the aggravators to receive additional evidence, but I don't anticipate that there will be a great deal of evidence in regard to any of the other aggravators, other than the one concerning pecuniary gain. And then also the aggravator concerning prevention of reporting something to law enforcement. That type of thing.

THE COURT: You weren't here. I think the case wasn't assigned to you, I believe, when I had all of the evidentiary hearing --

MR. BUTNER: That's right.

THE COURT: -- but you are reviewing --

MR. BUTNER: I am looking at transcripts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Sears.

MR. SEARS: I feel very much in the position that I was in when I first stood up here, Your Honor. I can't tell from Mr. Butner's remarks whether the State is thinking that because it's their burden that they are going

to offer more evidence, and I certainly can't tell from his comments whether he thinks he would be permitted to present evidence that we have not seen.

This unspecified delayed evidence from Mr. Echols -- or any evidence from Mr. Echols, frankly. We have not seen a word from him. And it's not -- we are not in the same posture as a preliminary hearing in the beginning of the case. We are 15 months downstream from the death of Carol Kennedy. 15 months. We are 11 months --

THE COURT: Granting, of course, that the Steinle case didn't exist at that time.

MR. SEARS: That is true. But we are also nearly a year downstream from the noticing of these aggravators in the death penalty notice in this case.

And as I said in my reply, Your Honor, we believe that it is ethically incumbent upon any prosecutor -- not just Mr. Butner -- any prosecutor to know that they have at least probable cause when they allege the aggravator, and it is certainly the law after Chronis v Steinle that that is so, in this case.

And Mr. Butner says, in his pleading, essentially, that at least with respect to two of these aggravators, the pecuniary gain and the witness killing aggravator, that they don't have that evidence, that they need this additional, unspecified evidence from Mr. Echols

before they are ready to go forth. To us, that sounds like the State concedes that those aggravators were noticed without probable cause.

And to the extent that the State wants to bring in other evidence without some clear ruling from this Court about what the State may or may not offer, we are going to be put in an impossible position. In a preliminary hearing at the beginning of the case, everyone understands that that is usually the first time that the defendant sees or hears any of the evidence against him. But this is not that sort of a case. This is many, many, many months down the road.

THE COURT: No, I think that the <u>Steinle</u> case -- the <u>Chronis</u> case made an analogy to a preliminary hearing. As I read it, it's not saying that the same rules govern the determination, but rather, simply that a defendant has a right to a determination of whether there is probable cause to support the allegations made for purposes of the death penalty.

MR. SEARS: Our view, and the view that I think is becoming shared by people whose cases are further along in the process than this one, is that the hearing is conducted under Rule 5, not under Rule 12. And it contemplates full participation by the defendant, cross-examination of the State's witnesses. It's an

evidentiary hearing. It's not simply a one-sided grand jury presentation or even the sort of summary presentation that is allowed in preliminary hearings. I do recall the part analogizing it to a preliminary hearing in terms of how it could be conducted.

But our concern is this: Mr. Butner, as far as we can hear today, his best explanation for being late is "I overlooked it," and more troublingly, "We are just doing the best we can." And I am here to say that I don't think that's good enough, Your Honor.

The suggestion has been made by

Mr. Butner here directly that we are responsible, that

somehow we are in cahoots with Tom Henzy, and Mike Terribile,

and Chris Kottke, and other unnamed co-conspirators to

stonewall and delay the case. I would defy the prosecution

to show where we have actually done anything but try to move

this case along.

We are the ones that suggest dates and times for evidence reviews. We are the ones that provide names of witnesses to be interviewed. We are the ones that file motions like this motion to dismiss, to narrow the issues sooner rather than later.

This is a remarkable case, because it is a case in which the only people out there saying go slow, hold on a second, delay, are on that side of this courtroom.

The defendant in this case wants this case to move forward.

We picked that date because we thought it was reasonable with the Court's permission and the Court's calendar. We think it is reasonable, but only if -- and only the "if" is if the State plays by the rules. And the rules begin with Rule 1.3 and Rule 35.1: Respond to important motions on time, and if you can't, don't wait until you hear from the other side to say you are sorry.

This is not a criminal trespass case.

This is a capital murder case, Your Honor. It couldn't be more important, the stakes couldn't be higher, and our client sits in jail while this is pending.

THE COURT: Nor would I suggest it is something that requires, at this Chronis hearing, a determination beyond a reasonable doubt. It is a probable cause determination.

MR. SEARS: I understand. I understand, Your Honor.

But it's new probable cause, and it may not be subject to a decision by this Court simply on the state of the record in this case.

However, if the Court were to grant our request for sanctions and apply Rule 35.1 as written, which says an unresponded to motion is deemed submitted on the record, that is what I think the rules contemplate in this

case. And had Mr. Butner asked for more time, had Mr. Butner filed a motion to a large -- had Mr. Butner done anything that counsel would ordinarily be expected to do if they knew they were going to be late on a response to a motion like this one, Your Honor, then I would have a different position about how this should be handled, but I don't think so.

THE COURT: Couldn't he have simply not responded at all and relied on your disjunctive, though, in terms of your asking in the disjunctive for an evidentiary hearing to be conducted?

MR. SEARS: Well, I think if you read our motion as a motion to dismiss, and if the Court is not prepared to dismiss, then and only then a request for a Chronis hearing. It's not truly --

THE COURT: I am not prepared to dismiss. I will say that.

But I read your motion, and I believe that it specifies the disjunctive of authorizing, under the Chronis decision, an evidentiary hearing.

I don't want to revisit all of the evidence that's already been conducted. I would like both sides to acknowledge that I have received evidence already, and since the decision is directed to me for my decision, frankly, if you wanted to refresh me in terms of my recollection about particulars of the evidence or give me

portions of transcripts that pertain to the things that you want me to recognize in terms of what the evidence has done, to the extent that you haven't already -- and I recognize that you have in some of the comments you made on specific allegations for death penalty purposes -- I can do that. If something further is in need of development because the Simpson issues were addressed to something different than what this Chronis motion is directed to, I am willing to give time for doing that.

But I think the State conceivably could have simply not responded at all and relied -- and come here and sought the evidentiary hearing that was being requested as an alternative to the dismissal.

So I would like to go ahead and set a hearing. You have told me before that you would prefer not to impinge upon the November hearing time frame that I have set for other motions. So I would like to go ahead and set an appropriate amount of time that would provide for a hearing to bring out any other information in support of probable cause or lack of probable cause, as the case may be, for whatever the death penalty allegations, for any individual. One of them is appropriate.

MR. SEARS: I understand --

THE COURT: I'll reaffirm the previous orders that I entered with regard to discovery and disclosure,

however. So I will note that at this time.

MR. SEARS: Do I take that, then, Your Honor, to indicate that the Court would not permit the State at this hearing to introduce undisclosed or late disclosed information without -- we just want to be sure we are prepared when we walk in here that day.

THE COURT: I would like to have the State disclose -- if they are going to do it -- in sufficient time in advance of the hearing for you to be able to respond to it. If the expert -- any one of the experts listed get their reports out to you in the next week or so, then I think you will have sufficient time to be able to subpoena any additional witnesses that you may need to counter that information.

It is a probable cause determination. I don't see that there need be some additional discovery. I tend to agree with your observation about the requirements of having probable cause at the time you make the allegations for purposes of invoking the death penalty.

So that is a long way, I guess, around saying yes, but I would countenance receiving information at that point in time, but I think I am going to have to do some kind of cutoff in advance of the hearing that may be at least two weeks, if not three, in advance of the hearing. The information that they are going to rely on for purposes of

1 that hearing needs to be disclosed. 2 MR. SEARS: When are you thinking about 3 setting this, Your Honor? Tuesday, October 20th, if you are 4 THE COURT: available. 5 Sure. Everyone is scrambling for 6 MR. SEARS: 7 their BlackBerry, but I know I will be here, Your Honor. And I have two hours in the THE COURT: 8 morning on Tuesday, October 20th, from 10:00 till noon. 9 10 that is not sufficient for both sides to bring out whatever you need to, beyond what I've already heard in the Simpson 11 hearing, I can do it the following week, Tuesday, October 27. 12 13 And there I have essentially two hours in the morning and currently don't have anything set in the afternoon. 14 MR. SEARS: Let's see what the oracles tell 15 16 us, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. BUTNER: Tuesday, October the 20th, works 18 19 for me, Judge. Do you think two hours is going to 20 THE COURT: 21 be enough? MR. BUTNER: I believe so. 22 That would be in keeping, also, 23 THE COURT: with setting the monthly review, as far as status of the case 24 and whether further witness interviews have been done and 25

1 those sorts of things. So it would keep our monthly time 2 frame that we have been keeping anyway, going into October. 3 We will have a quorum on our side MR. SEARS: 4 for both of those days, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Let me set you for 6 ten o'clock, then, on Tuesday, October 20th, for the next 7 meeting in regards to that issue. And that is any additional 8 evidence and oral argument concerning what has or has not 9 been proven by probable cause or aggravating factors. Chronis hearing. 10 11 So Chronis hearing, two hours, including 12 hopefully, within that time we will also be able to handle 13 the pretrial and see how things stands. Two hours on each of those days? 14 MR. SEARS: 15 I was only scheduling two hours THE COURT: because that is how much Mr. Butner suggested I would need. 16 I think we probably need as much 17 MR. SEARS: time as Mr. Butner says he is going to take. 18 I don't have that much time on the THE COURT: 19 20 I could, as I say, give you another couple of hours on 20th. the 27th. 21 22 MR. SEARS: If we could reserve both days. 23 Thank you. 27th for two hours, ten o'clock to 24 THE COURT: 25 noon on the 27th of October is also ordered.

1	MR. BUTNER: Judge, I don't have time that
2	day. I have another trial set to go on October 27 in
3	Pro Tem B.
4	THE COURT: Judge Darrow?
5	MR. BUTNER: Yes. Six-day trial.
6	THE COURT: I have well, I am not able to
7	put anything else on that day, and I am up against I am
8	currently in trial on another couple of cases that week,
9	also.
10	Any chance you can dish that case off to
11	somebody?
12	MR. BUTNER: I wish I could, Judge. No, there
13	really isn't.
14	THE COURT: Is that a four-day trial?
15	MR. BUTNER: It's a six-day trial.
16	THE COURT: Does it resume on Tuesday,
17	November 3rd?
18	MR. BUTNER: Yes. November 3rd and
19	November 4th.
20	THE COURT: Any chance, with this amount of
21	notice, that Judge Darrow could move that to the last two
22	days of the week instead of the
23	MR. BUTNER: I don't know about that. I
24	really don't.
25	THE COURT: So that I could use

Mr. Sears, any thoughts?

MR. SEARS: Your Honor, we are just anxious to get this heard. We want the Court and Mr. Butner to know that should the Court not dismiss the death penalty allegation in this case, we have many other motions that we would bring immediately, going after other aspects of the propriety or the lack of propriety of the death penalty in this case that we will want to have heard, perhaps in those November hearings, when the Court said it wanted to hear those kinds of issues.

We have been trying -- we tried -- that's why we filed this motion in August trying to narrow the issues in this case, to detest mightily whether or not this is a capital prosecution, which is our position in this case.

I understand everyone's schedule, but whatever the Court can do to find time, and Mr. Butner can do to find time, we think is terribly important. We can't think of anything that would be more important on anybody's calendar than this issue in this case.

THE COURT: Well, you tell that to the other defendants that have equal due process rights.

MR. SEARS: I try. I try.

THE COURT: I hear what you are saying.

Well, at this point, I will set you for two hours on the 20th. I will see what I can do and talk to

Judge Darrow about the possibilities of having, perhaps, a
Wednesday-Thursday schedule that week for Mr. Butner. If he
can accommodate me to finish the hearing within two weeks on

November, that would be the 3rd --

MR. SEARS: Here's a suggestion, then, Your Honor. If we are going to start on the 20th, October 1st is less than three weeks prior to that. I would ask the Court to consider cutting off all disclosure and any evidence that the State would want to offer at the 20th hearing and the resume hearing after the 20th, at the end of the day on September 30th.

THE COURT: Mr. Butner?

MR. BUTNER: Judge, it is one thing to cut off discovery. It is another thing to cut off analysis by expert.

We have got just a huge amount of computer information, and in fact, stuff that they haven't even been able to get into. So I don't think that that is -- I don't think that is fair, and I don't think that is appropriate. Like I said, we have a guy living in Phoenix doing this now.

And I think it makes sense to cut off disclosure. That is fine. We've got it all copied and provided to the defense. But to stop the analysis of evidence, that is ridiculous.

1 I don't think that is what THE COURT: 2 Mr. Sears is saying. I think he is saying for purposes of 3 the hearing that I cut off your use of any of that 4 information that is disclosed after October 1st or after 5 September 30th, is what he is asking for. 6 MR. BUTNER: Well, I would ask, then in that 7 regard, that it be that you give us two weeks prior to the 8 date of the hearing. And the hearing is on -- starts on 9 October 20th. So then that would be the 6th. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Sears, anything else you 11 wanted to say? 12 MR. SEARS: The State has had a year since the case was filed, when you run out to October 20th. They have 13 had 15 months now, soon to be 16 months. 14 I will pick Judge Hinson's 15 THE COURT: 16 retirement day. You have until the 2nd of October. the end of next week. 17 MR. BUTNER: Thanks, Judge. 18 19 Thank you. MR. SEARS: 20 THE COURT: The next motion I think you had, Mr. Sears, was pertaining to release. 21 22 MR. SEARS: I do. Your Honor, thank you. We are extremely grateful for the Court's 23 earlier ruling following the Simpson hearing, determining 24 Mr. DeMocker was subject to bond in this case. And we 25

appreciate the Court's patience in hearing us in our first motion to modify the amount of the bond initially set.

I want to say a couple of things. We have prepared a presentation for you that is part of our overall presentation today, that we are not sure, of course, what the Court's thinking was when the Court declined to reduce the bond from the \$2.5 million arrangement we originally asked you for.

We think things have changed on the ground, and we have a new proposal and a different proposal to make to you today that we hope will address what we think may be one of your concerns, which is the question of whether Mr. DeMocker truly intended to run away before he was arrested and whether he poses a flight risk if he were released from jail in this case. There are a couple of general points I want to make about what I think has happened in this case.

One of the factors that the statute and the rule I'd tell the Court to look at is the relevant strength of the State's case. And without repeating what I said here earlier this afternoon, our view remains that the State's case has gotten absolutely no stronger with the passage of time from the last time we were before you, and we think that is significant. And it's not for lack of trying.

We now know that in the interim

Mr. Butner has taken over this case and has identified additional experts. Nothing has been presented. No new facts have been presented that would tie Mr. DeMocker to this terrible crime. No direct physical evidence was present when Doug Brown signed search warrant affidavits a year ago. No

new physical evidence has come to light in the interview.

in this case.

The case against Mr. DeMocker is entirely circumstantial. And as the State now concedes in its response, basically it's limited to the fact they he had the opportunity, in the time frame that this murder took place, to commit it because he was out in the woods and didn't have anybody see him out there to corroborate his alibi in this case. I simply point that out because I think it's a factor

The Court previously ruled that the evidence that the State had presented in the <u>Simpson</u> hearing didn't rise to the level of proof evident, presumption great. And I wouldn't think that if we had another <u>Simpson</u> hearing today, the Court's ruling would change any. The evidence is no stronger and, in fact, the further we go down the road and the closer we get to trial, the more striking I think that becomes.

The next factor that I want to talk about is the position of the victim in this case. The only time we've ever heard from anybody officially as a victim in this

case was at the hastily arranged initial appearance before

Judge Markham immediately after Mr. DeMocker was arrested

last October, and Victim Services reported that Ruth Kennedy,
who was the mother, obviously, of Carol Kennedy, wanted

Mr. DeMocker held without bond in that case.

I am here to tell you that there are other victims in this case, Your Honor, the DeMocker children, Katie and Charlott. And I am sorry that their independent counsel has not been retained to be here to address you directly.

But I can tell you this -- and I don't think it's anything sinister or improper -- but I can tell you that I talk regularly with both Charlott and Katie.

Charlott is here in court. Katie is in New York on a school project with the United Nations.

But I can tell you and they would tell you, if you needed to hear it directly from them, that their strongest wish in the world is to have their father home.

They believe absolutely in his innocence in this case. They know that he's innocent.

And over the last year, Your Honor,

Charlott, in her last year at home -- she is a senior at the

high school -- has had to go through Thanksgiving, Christmas,

Mother's Day, Father's Day, the anniversary of her mother's

death, the beginning of her senior year in high school,

without her father. She has not been able to touch her father, now, for 11 months in this case.

If there was strong evidence in this case that Mr. DeMocker was guilty, if there was a videotaped confession, if there was physical evidence that put him at the scene of the crime, if Carol Kennedy's blood was found on him, then maybe we would have a different situation. Maybe we could feel differently about whether Mr. DeMocker should be out of custody, pending this case. But that's not so. We don't have that evidence in this case, and the Court is aware of that.

Charlott and Katie have been without their father. They have lost everything. They've lost their home. They lost their next home. They lost their mother. There is a possibility they could lose their father forever in this case. There is a possibility their father could be put to death in front of them in this case.

And despite of all of that, they speak with one voice, and the one voice says that they want their father home, and they want their father home as soon as the Court can see its way to let that happen in this case.

Here is what we have to offer today.

It's a three-part program. We are proposing that

Mr. DeMocker be released on a greatly reduced bond. We had

previously talked about \$250,000.

The DeMocker family is here -- as many of them as could be here for today's hearing. And their financial position has not changed for the better since we were here before. If anything, it has changed for the worse, because over time they have had to contribute more money for the support of the DeMocker children and the DeMocker family.

I've marked as an exhibit, Your Honor, a statement that Dr. and Mrs. DeMocker -- Steve's parents have prepared for the Court here. I provided a copy to Mr. Butner. I offer this in this hearing, which is not an evidentiary hearing, in lieu of their personal testimony, because time is short.

But in the statement, Your Honor, you can see they express their love and their belief in their son's innocence and repeat what I've just said about the effect that this has had on both the Kennedy and the DeMocker families, and particularly on Charlott and Katie DeMocker in this case. They would be involved in this, because if the Court were to adopt our proposal, the DeMocker family -- primarily Dr. and Mrs. DeMocker, but also Steve's brothers and sisters would have to shoulder the burden of raising the premium and the collateral for this bond.

And that is important, because Steve knows his family and knows the love and support of his family that is there. It is unthinkable of Steve to put any of them

in jeopardy. And the loss of the bond collateral would be devastating to the family members that post it in this case.

And with the weakness of the evidence against him, the incentive for Steve to run away and avoid prosecution in this case and leave and abandon his daughters, who have supported him completely, and devastate his family in a financial way is unthinkable and unimaginable to Steve and, I would hope, to the Court in this case.

The second part of this proposal is the use of the Pretrial Services Division, the Adult Probation Department, but only in conjunction with what I am about to show you, which is a very sophisticated, high-tech, GPS-based electronic monitoring system. I talked in general terms about electronic monitoring, now knowing very much about it when we were here before. I know a great deal more about it, and with the Court's permission, we would like to show you a little demonstration of the program that we would put in place.

But here is how it would work, Your

Honor. The idea would be that the Court would determine the

boundaries of an electronic fence that would be placed around

Mr. DeMocker. And the way that works is using technology

software and hardware provided by a company called Pro Tech,

who already provides the same equipment and services to

Yavapai County for the supervision of adult sex offenders.

Another company called GSSC, in Minneapolis, has put together a program that provides active monitoring. And I came to understand -- and stop me, Your Honor, if you know all of what I am about to say. But the difference, generally, between active and passive monitoring is pretty stark.

Passive monitoring is what I had in mind when I was before you the last time and what the probation department uses. And there is a certain sense that it is on the honor system. There is an electronic monitoring device on the ankle of the individual, and once a day that individual is required to take that monitoring device and put it into a dock, and it downloads information showing where that person has been. And then the probation department or whomever is supervising that person can look and see if that person has followed the rules -- stayed away from playgrounds and schools and places where children gather. It really doesn't do a great deal to guarantee that that person is where they are supposed to be in real time.

By contrast, active monitoring works very differently. It uses cell phone technology. And the device transmits, every minute, a cell phone signal with GPS coordinates to a series of computers.

GSSC has a program where -- and we'll show it to you. We'll show you how it works -- where you can

track virtually in real time the exact location and movements of that individual.

In addition, the device itself sends out what are called "alerts," and the alerts can be set up by the Court's order, with the help of this company, to require Mr. DeMocker to be in a particular place. It can be as restricted as his home. It can be as large as the Court wants to make it.

We are going to show you a demonstration where we just arbitrarily created this electronic fence -it's called an "inclusion area" -- that covers where
Mr. DeMocker would propose to reside, out White Spar Road -in the downtown area, including this building, my office, my
new office on Gurley Street, the probation department, and
areas in between.

You can also create "exclusion zones."

And for purposes of this demonstration, we chose the airport,
for obvious reasons, and the residence at Bridle Path.

And what happens is if the individual goes out of the boundaries of the inclusion zone or enters into the boundary of the exclusion zone, it sounds out an alert. And the alerts are sent -- there are four possible options: e-mail, a text message to a telephone, a fax, or a page. And you can send out any combination of those to essentially as many people as the Court identifies.

So we had in mind using the Pretrial
Services Department, who have round-the-clock surveillance
officers, as the first line of receipt, but it could be
anybody. It could be Mr. Butner's cell phone. It could be
Detective McDormett's cell phone. It could be one of the
investigators. They can have faxes and e-mails and text
messages and request for pages sent to as many people as they
want, including the Court -- including anyone that the Court
thinks should be aware of this -- the dispatch number of the
sheriff's department, the dispatch number of the Prescott
Police Department with instructions.

In addition, we would propose that Mr. DeMocker report every day to the Pretrial Services

Department. If the Court allows him the ability to go some distance away from his proposed residence, he could report in person every single day.

In addition, the Court knows that they do random unannounced surveillance at the location of where he is supposed to be, and he could have a curfew. There is really no limit to the rules that we could impose on Mr. DeMocker. Mr. DeMocker is certainly, without question, willing to and ready to accept any rules that the Court imposes, including absolute house arrest.

The system is so sophisticated, Your Honor, that you can have a schedule -- you can say

Mr. DeMocker shall be at his residence and no place else, but every Tuesday at two o'clock he is permitted to go from two o'clock to three o'clock to my office or for scheduled court appearances, to come here. And then that would change the boundaries of this inclusion zone, but not on a permanent basis -- just on a scheduled basis.

In addition, the customization possibilities are pretty much endless. We will show you -- we picked randomly, in a regularly shaped area, just to show you for demonstration purposes, that the Court can be as creative as it chooses to be in deciding where he can go.

So you have the combination of a bond, the forfeiture of which would be a horrible thing for Steve to imagine, Pretrial Services's regular scrutiny, and this GPS monitoring. That is what we are proposing in this case.

Before I do the demonstration, I have one other thing that I want to bring to the Court's attention.

During our evidence review, we finally got to put our hands on these books. Much as been said about these books, to two grand juries and to this Court, as evidence that Mr. DeMocker intended to flee. We've looked at them.

They are actually junk, Your Honor. I don't know any other way to put them. They are cheaply written. They suggest things like dressing as a hobo or hiding in abandoned farm buildings. They are really not

something that is serious.

And when she was interviewed by the police, Ms. Gerard -- Mr. DeMocker's girlfriend -- said she thought this whole thing was a joke -- this whole thing being the idea of running away.

These books are not dog-eared, they are not written in. There is no evidence whatsoever that Mr. DeMocker did one thing that any of the books suggest, because they are ridiculous ideas. And Mr. DeMocker immediately knew that -- as he told the police when he was arrested on October 23rd -- that it was stupid and fear-based.

What was he afraid of? He was afraid of being arrested without probable cause for a crime he didn't commit. That's what he was afraid of. But where was he arrested? Sitting at his desk, in his office, where they knew he would be.

Mr. DeMocker talked to the police when he was arrested. Mr. DeMocker talked to the police for hours the night of Carol Kennedy's murder in this case.

Mr. DeMocker has cooperated in other ways.

We have received anonymous information.

We turned it over to the County Attorney's Office. Without going into any details on the record, Mr. DeMocker has provided what we think is an amazing level of cooperation in

this case, because we are interested in finding out who did this. We are interested in finding the real killer in this case, Judge.

But I wanted the Court not to be afraid of these books. I wanted the Court -- and to the extent that Mr. Butner is willing to do it -- leave them here for the Court to look at. They are laughable, at best. Under other circumstances, a refund probably would have been in order in this case.

So with the Court's permission, if we could do a brief demonstration with this GPS unit, we've got it set up here.

THE COURT: I will comment that I am aware of the sex offender monitoring. I have had presentations by the probation office with regard to passive and active, but I am willing to listen and see how this compares to what their program is.

MR. SEARS: Thank you. Let me tell you what we did. Mr. Robertson, our investigator, has been sort of the point person on this, and has obtained -- we actually have -- this is the device. This is the transmitter here. It has a strap. The strap actually has electronics in it so that tampering with the strap or cutting the strap sends an alert signal. The alert signal -- it flashes green and red. And then -- so this obviously goes on the ankle.

But what we have done over the last couple of days is experiment with it. And on our own, with the assistance of GSSC in Minneapolis, we have done some experiments. And what we are going to show you are the visual representations that anyone looking at this would be able to see.

But for purposes of rather than doing a live demonstration and wasting a half an hour driving around town, we did this yesterday and today, so that we can show it to you now. And we have done some things on purpose: We have forced some zone alerts; we have driven out the pre-set zone; we have taken the strap off to create a strap alert.

And then we can show you, on our cell phones, the alerts that were sent. We set it up to send text massages, for example, to Mr. Robertson's phone and my phone. And we can show you how that works, and we can actually show you the message.

And this is a -- simply a demonstration of how this works, and we can also show you the computer screens. And the way this works, also, is anybody that is given permission within the list of people, can go online at any time and log in and open up these screens and watch Mr. DeMocker. See where he is.

And it has GPS coordinates, and it shows -- there is a running clock that shows where he is at

any given moment -- any movements like that. And then every day, a report is e-mailed to whomever asks for it, showing all of his activity for the day and any error alerts that were reported during the day.

So it is a pretty powerful presentation. It will take us a few minutes to show it to you, but if the Court would bear with us, I think it would be important for the record in this case. Thanks.

MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

This is the device that Mr. Sears was saying. And inside this device is both cellular and GPS technology. Unlike the passive system that you are aware of through the sex offender program, this device actually sends a signal directly to cell phone towers, which transmits to the computer systems in Minneapolis, that can be viewed by anybody that has the software that Mr. Sears mentioned.

In a passive system that you are familiar with, this transmits -- this is on the ankle. This transmits to a device that the offender wears on a belt. And then that device goes into a charging unit that is connected to a phone line, and that transmits. That is not in real time. So it's only like once a day that somebody would know what the device -- where the device has been.

This device would go full time. I hope this hasn't shut off while we have been waiting. But the

mapping program that comes with this is accessible through any kind of a Windows-based software, and we are using just a wireless setup through the court -- and of course it logged out while we were standing here.

Essentially, this is what -- looks like we have the signal. This is the kind of map that would show up when somebody gets monitored when the system is brought in. This shows the Prescott area, generally. We are approximately there. And this can be zoomed in or to the street levels. Right now you can see we are looking at it from a 22-and-a-half-mile range.

And we created just arbitrarily, as

Mr. Sears said, an irregularly shaped inclusion zone, just to
show you that it is possible to create any type of area that
the Court may wish to include. And this can be as small as a
home, or it can be as large as an entire state.

So we have just created the kind of populated area of downtown Prescott. On the east, out at shopping mall area, and on the north, just up in this area, just short of the outer loop, and then down in here is where Mr. DeMocker would be proposing to stay. Let me show you what happens.

We had this -- I just carried this around yesterday in my vehicle -- this would be strapped on somebody's ankle -- and I drove it to see what would happen.

And this records from 5:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., roughly. And I want to show you everywhere that we drove.

What happens is it just starts transmitting this information. It goes into storage. And this would be seen in virtually real time, if somebody was watching it.

And you can see these green arrows turn red as soon as they got to the end. This is when it transmitted an alert saying this person has left the exclusion zone.

The reason I went south -- as you know, this is a fairly dense canyon and wooded area down here. I wanted to see if all of these points are being recorded by this device, and in fact they were.

Once it re-entered the inclusion zone, it turned green again. The system is set up in such a way that it would send an alert to whoever is monitoring this, that the person has re-entered the inclusion zone.

This is on pause, now, so I will replay it. Resumes it back into town. So I went east. As soon as it left the area, I got another alert. Turned around and came back. This is where Mr. Sears's offices are and the court. We were there for a little while, working on another matter, and then left and went north.

As you can see down below here, it is

giving the exact time of each point. I will replay it just to -- actually, rewind it. All this information can be recovered at any time, which is why we are doing it this way.

It tells you exactly what time the person was at a certain location. Tells you how fast they were going and where it is all heading. So all of this information is stored in the computer and is transmitted in nearly live time.

We did a couple of experiments downtown by removing the strap, for example, to see what kind of an alert we would get, and it's within three minutes the computer was showing an alert and a text message was arriving on the person's phone -- whoever was designated to do the alert.

When this replays going to the north, we show you -- we created some arbitrary exclusion zones, just to show you what something like that might look. You can see this is around the airport, around Love Field. We just created a box that is about a quarter-of-a-mile across. This would -- about a half-mile, excuse me. Anytime somebody entered that area, as opposed to an inclusion zone where they leave the area -- if they entered that area, it would send an alert.

Same for Bridle Path. Just around the home at Bridle Path is where we created another exclusion

| zone.

So any number of zones like this can be created, depending on the wishes of the Court. And again, it could be of any size or any rules about the times. You can modify these in lots of different ways.

So this creates an assurance to anybody who is concerned about this, about the pretrial release, will know fairly quickly where the person is at all times, and whether or not they are staying within the boundaries, and action could be taken.

We have a gentleman from the General Services Security Corporation who is the active monitoring specialist. He is on standby in Minneapolis on his cell phone. If the Court has any questions, he is available to answer any questions.

I can tell you that this company does active monitoring within the State of Arizona for cities and towns and -- mostly in the Phoenix metro area. They also have about 5,000 of these units in service in California. They are experiencing this kind of tracking type of service.

MR. SEARS: Your Honor, I have a couple of other observations about this. Because of the ability to draw the inclusion area, the electronic fence, as tightly as the Court wants, as Mr. Robertson said, down to a particular house -- this is a way to actually monitor house arrest. If

you superimpose this system and the 24-hour monitoring and this virtually instantaneous alert system with the kind of physical surveillance and reporting with Pretrial Services, it is difficult to imagine a more comprehensive program to assure everyone -- the Court primarily, the County Attorney and the public -- that Mr. DeMocker will be precisely where he has been ordered to be in this case.

The advantages of this, I think, are unique because, first of all -- I don't know if I mentioned this -- the proposal is it's \$20 dollar a day for this, and the DeMocker family would pay this, so there would be absolutely no cost to the system. If there were training cost or set-up costs for GSSC to come and do that, we would pay for that, as well.

But we think the Adult Probation

Department has experience, generally, with the Pro Tech

software. The interface, the way that the screens look and

feel is very similar. Mr. Robertson is right, there is a

difference, because this unit has the active monitoring

capability that the passive system that the County presently

uses doesn't have.

And we are not suggesting that someone would be required to sit 24 hours a day staring at a computer screen, seeing where Mr. DeMocker went. That is really the beauty of the system, is that it is all automated.

The system itself generates the alerts. And then whatever action is deemed appropriate, depending on the nature of the violation, can be called into play by whomever it is that gets these alerts, and they can do it in any number of ways. It can go right to dispatch of the police at the sheriff's office, it can go right to an investigator, it can go right to a detective, it can go to anybody. The logical people, the first responders might be the Pretrial Services surveillance officers in the Adult Probation Department, in this case.

But there is also the incentive -Mr. DeMocker knows what this means. Mr. DeMocker knows that
if he is granted this opportunity to be free pending this
case, he has to be where he is and he has to comply with the
rules of this electronic monitoring, just as he has to comply
with other rules that the Court would impose. And there is a
great incentive for Mr. DeMocker to do just that.

Mr. DeMocker wants his day in court mightily. He wants to be exonerated on these charges and expects to be exonerated on these charges. And it would be foolish for him -- beyond foolish for him to abuse or take advantage of this opportunity.

There are a couple of other points that I wanted to make. I made them in my written submission to the Court. Despite the best efforts of the sheriff's department

and Mr. Butner to try and accommodate some of the things we've asked for, it's pretty clear that a couple of things are never going to happen inside the jail.

1.8

Mr. DeMocker's ability to have reasonable access to his files and his documents, which now number more than 60,000 -- whether it is by a secured computer on a reasonable basis, in a private, secure place with a private, secure phone, are not likely to be available, despite what the State has suggested. None of what we have proposed has been implemented so far, and what is happening is really going in the other direction.

Recently, Mr. DeMocker's phone -Mr. DeMocker only can call from a phone located in his dorm.
There is absolutely no privacy. And if he makes recorded calls to his family or unmonitored calls to me, he has to make them from inside his unit in the jail.

So there is absolutely no privacy or security from the other inmates, nor is it possible for him to have any sort of lengthy communications. As I said I think before, about every 15 minutes the phone is cut off, and he would have to re-dial.

And he shares a phone with 35 other inmates. Actually, it's more than that. There is 15 cells, three to a cell. There's 44 other inmates that use this same phone. Mr. DeMocker can't use that phone.

The people with whom Mr. DeMocker would have to work on a regular basis are scattered across the country in different time zones. And the cost of having them come to Mr. DeMocker, as opposed to Mr. DeMocker's ability to interface with them from his home here in Prescott, subject to all of these restrictions on his movement, makes much more sense and is much more economical and a cost saving, in a obvious way, should that be permitted in this case.

We appreciate the efforts that Mr. Butner and the jail have made, but I think they know and we know that there is no substitute for Mr. DeMocker having his own time to work on his own case. He hasn't really been able to do that in the 11 months that he has been in jail. He has only been allowed to keep whatever paperwork he can get under his bunk. And he told me a pretty disturbing story about a mentally disturbed cell mate who decided it was a good day to take all his papers out and throw them all over the cell.

And he is only allowed to have in his cell what he can bring with him when he comes to court. He can't leave anything behind when he comes over here. So he obviously can't have hard copies of his file. It is becoming increasingly difficult.

There is the difficulty of just

Mr. DeMocker being an hour away from me, and he is closer to

me than anybody else on the defense team. It is terribly

difficult.

And the visitation arrangements over there are limited. The jail does their best with what they have, but I am just one person visiting with one client, and there are hundreds of people in the jail that have visitation requirements, and there is precious little space in the jail for that work.

And most of the time when I visit

Mr. DeMocker, I am speaking with him on a phone with a

partition between us. Every time I have a contact visit with

him, Mr. DeMocker has to be strip-searched. He has been

strip-searched in excess of 75 times, now, on some sort of

presumption that I am going to pass contraband to him. I

understand the jail's need for security, but it is

humiliating and degrading and offputting to Mr. DeMocker, to

the point where we have very few contact visits anymore,

because I don't want to have him go through that

unnecessarily.

Judge, this is a proposal that we think honestly should reassure the Court that Mr. DeMocker will be precisely where he is to be and no place else. If the Court is concerned about Mr. DeMocker having the kind of movement that we arbitrarily picked here out by Ponderosa Park and out Iron Springs Road, we would have absolutely no objection to the Court shrinking down the zone to whatever the Court

chooses, all the way down to house arrest.

Miss Gerard has rented a house in Cathedral Pines. That is a subdivision across from the Pine Top Community up on top of the hill there. That is where Mr. DeMocker would live if he were released on these terms and conditions, with his daughter, who is a senior in the high school.

We think, from an efficiency point of view, at least making his zone large enough for him to go from there, here to my office, to my new office at Gurley and Mt. Vernon, and perhaps to the Probation Department to report daily would make sense. But we are not married to that idea, Your Honor. We are more than willing to be flexible.

And we are deadly serious about this, and Mr. DeMocker is serious and would tell you that there is absolutely no chance that he would do anything to cause the Court to have less faith in him or less trust in him. He wasn't going to run away. It was never a serious idea. These books underscore that. It was something that ran through his mind in a time that was incredibly traumatic.

The mother of his children was killed in a violent, bloody way. He had two daughters to deal with. From the first day, he had some sense that he was being looked at as a suspect. And he didn't go anywhere. He stayed where he was supposed to be.

Where he was supposed to be on the day he was arrested, and he talked with the police again after he was arrested, even though his lawyer may have told him later that that wasn't something that he needed to have done. He did it anyway, because he wanted the police to understand his position in this case.

I have -- I can answer questions, if the Court has any. This system is one that can be implemented pretty quickly. If the Court doesn't want to take the responsibility for either designing the inclusion zone or -- and/or the identities of the people that would be on the alert list, I would be happy to work with the State, with the sheriff's office, with the adult probation to do it in the best, most efficient way, and we would drop whatever we were doing to undertake that project.

But that is our presentation. That is what we ask the Court to adopt.

THE COURT: Mr. Butner.

MR. BUTNER: Judge, let's not lose sight of the fact that this defendant is someone that Yavapai County grand jury has found probable cause for committing the offense of burglary of Carol Kennedy's residence and then committing the offense of premeditated murder of Carol

Kennedy. This is someone who admittedly was stupidly getting

ready to flee.

And I guess, as Mr. Sears argues, he would be stupid to abuse this. What he is asking for is -- give me three steps. Give me three steps, Judge. Give me three minutes to the door. That is what they are asking for.

This stuff about it's virtually real time. Okay? All he has to do is drive on the Cherry Road from here to the Verde, and he is out of cell phone distance. I will tell you that. I think everything that practices law in this county knows it.

Judge, we should not trust a person who has been found to have probable cause to exist to have committed a murder here in Yavapai County. We should not trust them to be on the loose -- not with a cell phone monitoring system, not with an ankle band, not with something that is in virtually real time, not with something that will keep him in the inclusion zone, but a pager might go off if he left it. No, that doesn't make sense.

And you will notice that the defense has basically glossed right over the attempted accommodations by the State in this case. They just kind of let those go by the by. Offers that at least 40 hours a week he can sit and work with the computer and use all of the digitized

information that has been provided in this case. He can work on that himself. Offers that he can have access to a secure line with video to his attorney and the concession to allow a third party on that line with them by the jail people so that he can talk with expert witnesses from the jail, from the securely monitored cell where that video takes place. That is just ignored. That's no good. That's just not good enough.

And it's not good enough that he just remains in the jail like all the rest of the prisoners.

That's not good enough, even though it is an hour away from Mr. Sears's office. That's just not quite good enough.

There is really no limit in this case as to how far the defense is going to push this release issue, and they have ignored, basically, accommodations that the State has offered.

Judge, there is not new evidence here. There is not new conditions here. What we've got is just another run at getting Mr. DeMocker released, and this is a defendant that has already planned on getting -- on evading capture, on becoming a fugitive.

These books are not a joke. If they are, they are the worst joke in the poorest of taste. These books demonstrate how somebody can disappear. I have looked at these books. There is nothing funny about these books,

especially in the context of this case.

And let's not lose sight of the fact that this is a defendant who has already demonstrated that he is extraordinarily manipulative. A defendant that has hidden evidence by giving it to his lawyer.

Judge, this notion should be denied summarily.

THE COURT: Mr. Sears, I do have some other hearings at 4:30, so if you could be relatively brief.

MR. SEARS: Thank you, Your Honor. I will, Your Honor.

It is an overstatement to say that

Mr. DeMocker was getting ready to flee. That is not what the

evidence that the Court has heard.

The second grand jury found probable cause. This Court found that the evidence did not rise to the level of proof evident, presumption great, and admitted Mr. DeMocker to bond. And if the lottery should hit in the DeMocker family and two-and-a-half-million dollars comes into their possession, unless something is changed, Mr. DeMocker could be released with none of these conditions on that bond. That is the Court's current order in this case.

We are not just making another run at this. We have not proposed this juxtaposition of Pretrial Services and this particular kind of highly sophisticated

Mr. DeMocker would not be getting a three-minute head start in this case. It makes no sense to say that the two or three minutes between a zone alert and all of the different alerts

to all of the different people would allow Mr. DeMocker somehow to disappear.

active GPS monitoring, with all of the capacity it has.

The unit uses both cell phone and GPS technology. It's not simply a cell phone, so that if he goes into a cell phone dead area, he is hidden from view.

You saw the demonstration where

Mr. Robertson and I drove down White Spar and down 89, past

the second Ponderosa Park exit, and heading down to Wilhoit

in there, in an area of essentially no cell phone service. I

know the area quite well. I think the Court does. And you

can see, the red arrows were there. He was being tracked by

the GPS component here.

The proposals -- the accommodations in the jail, while they are encouraging, the video that they are talking about is a video link that goes now to the public defender's office. I have used it three or four times. It is only available in half-hour blocks on a schedule, around the public defender and all the other people that use that. The software is available for a fee. I know another attorney that has it.

The problem is, on Mr. DeMocker's end, it

is not secure. It's in a room off the old EDC courtroom, inside the jail, and there is a door and a pane of glass.

And whenever I would talk to Mr. DeMocker on the unit, there was a detention officer right outside the glass who was standing a foot or two away. When I am there in person, I can see that that room is neither soundproof nor secure, and it has a glass window in it.

THE COURT: I am familiar with the space.

MR. SEARS: You know the space. Thank you,

Your Honor.

I think suggesting that simply because a grand jury found probable cause, that that constitutes the kind of overwhelming evidence of guilt that means

Mr. DeMocker should not be out, is not where we are in this case. It's not consistent with the Court's prior rulings.

What we are proposing in combination, combination of a bond that be a huge hurdle for the family and a proven hurdle for the family, and the GPS monitoring at the family's expense, and Pretrial Services every day in-person, reporting or telephone, if the Court wants to put him on house arrest -- and house arrest if the Court wants to start him out or keep him on house arrest. It's so vastly superior to his current conditions as to make it something we think is worth the Court's consideration in this case.

What is the downside risk? What's the

downside risk? The downside risk is essentially the same as anybody, even people inside the jail, that they are going to appear. The jail take chances with people every day. We drive people in the middle of the night in a bus across the Cherry Road. There are things that could happen.

Does the Court believe that Mr. DeMocker would intentionally, as Mr. Butner said, in some manipulative way take advantage of the system to leave behind his children, leave behind his family, and run away from these charges and this evidence? That is what the Court, I think, has to decide.

I think that everything that the Court should know about those factors would move the Court towards the idea that with all of these safeguards in place,

Mr. DeMocker could be released in this case. It is the best option that we can think of to try to find two-and-a-half-million dollars and bond him out with no restrictions. This seems to us to be the kind of a program that should raise the Court's comfort level and should cause the Court to be sure that Mr. DeMocker is being watched and being monitored.

And he has every reason in the world -whether Mr. Butner believes it or not -- he has every reason
in the world to be compliant to these terms and conditions.
He would be given an opportunity, for which he would be

grateful. And it would be devastating to him, to his case, to his family, for him to do other than fully comply with the orders of the Court. It is something that I can't even imagine, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. I did hear, obviously, the <u>Simpson</u> hearing, and I am familiar with the facts, and those are the facts upon which I based my previous decision.

One of the concerns I have is whether there is some material change of circumstances now that should justify a modification of release conditions. So I need to think about that. I need to think about the other things that you've presented. I am going to take the matter under advisement at this time.

I think, clearly, if the death penalty were off the table, that would be some material change of circumstances. So I think something rides on that presentation that's made. I guess I am not certain that I will get a ruling out to you before I conduct that hearing, based on further determinations about whether the death penalty is applicable or not after the Chronis hearing.

So that matter is under advisement. I will confirm it, then, at the next setting.

I will try, in the meantime, to get ahold of Judge Darrow with regard to Mr. Butner's conflicting matter, so that he can have some -- perhaps have some time,

1	instead of beating him to the current week that is set in
2	November.
3	MR. SEARS: In your spare time, Your Honor, do
4	you want to take a look at these books or a representative
5	sampling thereof?
6	THE COURT: I can take a look at a
7	representative sampling. Either side wants me
8	MR. BUTNER: They are in evidence right now,
9	Judge.
10	THE COURT: Can you stick around for just a
11	couple of minutes, Mr. Butner, and I will take a look at
12	them?
13	Mr. Sears, you want to stick around?
14	MR. SEARS: I am here.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Sechez needs to stick around.
16	I guess I don't need you, Mr. Butner. If you choose to stay,
17	that is fine.
18	I will conclude this hearing so I can
19	proceed with the other couple, three hearings I have set,
20	without delaying those folks.
21	(Whereupon, these proceedings were concluded.)
22	***000***
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

I, ROXANNE E. TARN, CR, a Certified Reporter in the State of Arizona, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 - 71 constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

SIGNED and dated this 15th day of December, 2009.

